

REMARKS

Applicant submits the foregoing amendments and the following remarks in response to the final Office Action dated December 11, 2007. Applicant requests favorable consideration of the amended claims, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and a prompt allowance of this application.

Claims 2, 8, 10-12 and 22 are pending, with Claims 2 and 22 being independent. Claim 9 has been cancelled. Claims 2, 10-12, and 22 have been amended. Support for the claim changes can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure. Thus, Applicant submits that no new matter has been presented.

Claim to Priority

The Examiner has not yet acknowledged either Applicant's claim for priority or receipt of a certified copy of the priority document that was filed on September 1, 2004. A copy of the date-stamped postcard is attached. Applicant requests that the Examiner acknowledge these matters in the next Official Action.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 2, 8-12, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Smith (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,151) in view of Groner (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,643). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, for at least the following reasons.

The invention of independent Claims 2, 11, and 22 relates to creating a speech recognition dictionary to be used for creating a mail through voice input. A preferred

embodiment of the invention receives a transmitted mail from a transmission source and obtains a speech recognition dictionary corresponding to the transmission source. The obtained speech recognition dictionary contains a vocabulary. When a mail creation processing involving the transmitted mail is started, at least one unknown word (not existing in the dictionary) is extracted from the mail and added to the dictionary. Further, in one preferred embodiment, time information is stored indicating when the dictionary is updated, and the dictionary is deleted when a specified period of time has elapsed with respect to the time information. In another preferred embodiment, registration time information is stored indicating a time when each unknown word is added to the dictionary, and each such word is deleted after a specified period of time has elapsed from the time stored for that word.

Smith relates to a method and system using a speech recognition system to dictate a body of text in response to an available body of text. Groner relates to a speech recognition system and method for converting voice mail messages to electronic mail messages.

Neither Smith nor Groner teaches obtaining a speech recognition dictionary corresponding to the transmission source, wherein the speech recognition dictionary contains a vocabulary. Smith envisions only a solitary system vocabulary/dictionary. The Office Action relies on Groner's feature of obtaining a caller-specific voice file, as disclosed in columns 12 and 13. However, as described at column 8, lines 45-50, the caller-specific voice files of Groner "describe how the caller speaks," presumably containing vocal characteristics of the caller. These voice files do not contain a vocabulary, as recited in the present invention.

Further, neither Smith nor Groner suggest performing a deletion operation (of the entire speech recognition dictionary or of individual words) after a specified period of time has elapsed. To the contrary, Smith discloses that the removal of an update is delayed until after a sequence of related E-mails has been completed, or until after a fixed time delay following a satisfactory dictation of a responsive E-mail. Thus, whereas in Applicant's invention a deletion operation is performed based on a timing, in Smith such an operation is dependent on the external acts of the corresponding parties. Groner does not appear to mention any kind of deletion operation, much less the deletion operation of Applicant's invention.

Finally, neither Smith nor Groner suggest that registration time information is stored for each of a plurality of unknown words, and that each word is separately deleted based on its time information, as recited in Claims 11 and 22. Rather, in Smith, all of the updated information is removed together. Again, Groner does not teach an deletion operation.

Therefore, Smith and Groner do not teach or suggest at least these features of Applicant's invention, as recited in the independent claims, and the present invention would not have been obvious over Smith and Groner. The remaining claims in the present application are dependent claims that depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims and are allowable by virtue of their dependency and in their own right for further defining Applicant's invention. Favorable and independent consideration thereof is respectfully sought.

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and a prompt allowance of this application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher W. Ferguson/

Christopher W. Ferguson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59,809

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
CWF:ayr

FCHS_WS 2033782v1